

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-19, as amended, are pending in this application. In this Response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to highlight that, according to an embodiment of the present invention, the lens is not spherical and includes a portion that translates a beam along an elongated section of the lens between a device and an optical fiber. Applicants have also amended claim 2 to fix an error.

In light of the Office Action, Applicants believe these amendments serve a useful clarification purpose, independent of patentability. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim amendments do not limit the range of any permissible equivalents. As no new matter has been added, Applicants respectfully request entry of these amendments and remarks at this time.

## **THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 12-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102 over U.S. Patent No. 5,682,449 to Taira-Griffin (“Taira-Griffin”). Taira-Griffin discloses a technique for coupling two optical fibers without having to bend the optical fibers to make the connection. Taira-Griffin also discloses the use of a spherical (actually a hemispherical) lens. *See* Col. 1, lines 52-59, 63. Thus, light enters a spherical surface, reflects off of a reflective surface, and exits through another spherical surface. The lens does not include any elongated portions.

According to one embodiment, the present invention includes a lens comprising a reflecting curved surface for focusing a light beam. The lens includes a reflecting curved surface and a focusing curved surface. Light from an optical device is reflected off of the reflecting curved surface and conveyed through the focusing curved surface. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that, as the light passes between the reflecting curved surface and the focusing curved surface, it traverses an elongated, non-spherical section. *See, e.g.,* FIG. 2A and 2B and Written Description at Page 9, lines 12-15.

In light of the amendments to independent claim 1, Taira-Griffin fails to disclose all of the features currently claimed, *e.g.*, a lens that includes an elongated, non-spherical section through which the path of a light beam passes between a reflecting curved surface and a focusing curved surface. Because Taira-Griffin fails to teach each and every element of claim 1,

Applicants submit that the present invention is not anticipated. Applicants further submit that claims 2-3 and 12-19 are in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1, but also for additional novel features recited therein. As such, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

### **THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

At pages 4-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Taira-Griffin in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,628,027 to Brauss (“Brauss”). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Taira-Griffin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,388,171 to Michikoshi *et al.* (“Michikoshi”).

As discussed above, however, Taira-Griffin fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 1 as currently recited. Moreover, neither Brauss nor Michikoshi cure the deficiencies of Taira-Griffin, *i.e.*, they fail to teach or suggest a lens that includes an elongated, non-spherical section through which light passes between a reflecting curved surface and a focusing curved surface. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 4 and 10-11 are in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1, but also for additional novel features recited therein. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the present amendments and remarks still do not resolve all of the issues regarding the patentability of the pending claims, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned agent to discuss any remaining issues.

A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith to extend the time for response three months to and including August 22, 2006. A Fee Sheet Transmittal is submitted herewith to pay for the three-month extension of time. No other fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be required, however, please charge such fee to Bingham McCutchen LLP Deposit Account No. 195127, Order No. 25551.0010.

Respectfully submitted,  
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP

Dated: August 22, 2006

By:

  
Siddhesh V. Pandit, Registration No. 58,572  
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20007  
(202) 373-6513 Telephone  
(202) 424-7647 Facsimile